



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/756,257	11/26/96	SCHUELLERBERG	PT13248

PICKER INTERNATIONAL INC  
595 MINER ROAD  
HIGHLAND HEIGHTS OH 44143

QM41/0201

EXAMINER	
MANLYS WEECADER E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3737	

DATE MAILED:

02/01/99

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/756,257**

Applicant(s)  
**Schellenberg**

Examiner  
**Eleni Mantis Mercader**

Group Art Unit  
**3737**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eleni Mantis Mercader (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Mr. Fry (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jan 14, 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-17, 19-31, and 33-35

Identification of prior art discussed:

Barrick '594, Cosman '111, and Cartmell '592

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant requested clarification regarding the rejection of claims 1-2 and subsequent claims. Examiner explained how the fluoroscope in the Barrick '549 reference served as the means for indicating to a human the difference between the actual and desired positions of a tool. Also, examiner pointed out figure 4 which could be applied on rejecting claim 1. Applicant pointed out that his means corresponded to the display. Examiner was going to reconsider the rejection with regard to claim 25 as the reference of Cartmell '592 does not use infrared emitters and such use would destroy the reference. Applicant would either file an afterfinal or a continuation.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.